

REMARKS

In the Office Action of January 13, 2009, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-12, 14-21 and 23-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,396,612 B1 (“Bjorndahl”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,116,938 B2 (“Monroe et al.”). In addition, claims 3, 6, 13 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bjorndahl and Monroe et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0186846 A1 (“Nyberg et al.”) or U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0007641 A1 (“Kinoshita”).

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 11 and 20 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Bjorndahl and Monroe et al. As amended, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims 1, 11 and 20 are not obvious in view of Bjorndahl and Monroe et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-29 be allowed.

I. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 11 and 20

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites “*wherein the electrical circuit includes a plurality of interfaces configured for communication over the first communication channel, the interfaces including a Bluetooth interface, an infra-red light interface, and a wireless large area network interface for communication over the first communication channel, the electrical circuit further including a transmission device configured for transmission of carrier signals over the second communication channel,*” which is not disclosed in the cited references of Bjorndahl and Monroe et al. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Monroe et al., and request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The latest Office Action correctly states on page 3 that the cited reference of Bjorndahl “doesn’t teach specifically, the interfaces including at least two of a Bluetooth interface, an infra-red light interface, a wireless large area network interface.” However, the Office Action then states that the cited reference of Monroe

et al. discloses interfaces that include at least two of a Bluetooth interface, an infra-red light interface, and a wireless large area network interface. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the cited reference of Monroe et al. discloses only a Bluetooth transceiver system 220 and a 802.11b transceiver system 210. However, the cited reference of Monroe et al. does not disclose a device that includes “a Bluetooth interface, an infra-red light interface, and a wireless large area network interface for communication over the first communication channel,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Monroe et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 11 and 20, which recite limitations that are similar to those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 11 and 20 are also not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Monroe et al., and request that the amended independent claims 11 and 20 be allowed as well.

II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-10, 12-19 and 21-29

20

Each of the dependent claims 2-10, 12-19 and 21-29 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 11 and 20. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Furthermore, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional reasons.

As an example, the dependent claim 7 recites the limitations of “*wherein the communication enable information item contains an interface type information item which indicates the interfaces that are available in the communication partner device for communication over the first communication channel.*” The latest Office Action on page 5 alleges that the cited reference of Bjorndahl teaches “the communication partner device, circuit, and method as claimed in claim 1, 11, and 20, wherein the communication enable information item contains an interface type information item which indicates the interfaces that are available in the communication partner device

for communication over the first communication channel. [Bjorndahl: connection between devices; C5, L54-65, and C4, L34-48]” However, the cited passage of Bjorndahl does not mention any interface type information item contained in a communication enable information item (an encryption key) which indicates the interfaces that are available in the device for communication over a communication channel. Consequently, the cited reference of Bjorndahl does not disclose these limitations of the dependent claim 7. Thus, the dependent claim 7 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Monroe et al.

As another example, the dependent claim 8 recites the limitations of “*wherein the communication enable information item contains, in addition to the interface type information item, an interface preference information item which signifies one of the interfaces that is preferred in the communication partner device containing the communication enable information item.*” The latest Office Action on page 5 alleges that the cited reference of Bjorndahl teaches “the communication partner device, circuit and method as claimed in claim 7, 16, and 26, wherein the communication enable information item contains, in addition to the interface type information item, an interface preference information item which signifies one of the interfaces that is preferred in the communication partner device containing the communication enable information item. [Bjorndahl: connection between devices; C5, L54-65, and C4, L34-48]” However, the cited passage of Bjorndahl does not mention any interface preference information item contained in a communication enable information item (an encryption key) which signifies one of the interfaces that is preferred in the device. Consequently, the cited reference of Bjorndahl does not disclose these limitations of the dependent claim 8. Thus, the dependent claim 8 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Monroe et al.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Harnisch et al.

Date: April 13, 2009

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300